

From: Edit: Other:
Page: Page: Page:

46

Date:

Abroad

U.S. Policy As Seen From

A Special Report From Nine Areas

Britain

CPYRIGHT By DON COOK

LONDON In the present embittered, even hysterical, state of Anglo-American relations, the most difficult task is to try and sort out the realities.

A first and simple reality is that this situation is of really appalling seriousness and calls for an immediate end of what the former Ambassador to Washington, Sir Roger Makins, called "barren controversy" over who did what to whom, and how we got where we are.

A whole fabric of relationship and understanding between Britain and America has broken down, not just in the last two or three months, but over a period of years.

It has broken down on the "working level" of government and here the blame must be assigned to the tendency of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles to substitute "personal diplomacy" for an effective across-the-board working diplomatic relationship, not only with this nation but with others.

For this reason, the attitude of the United States in this crisis was as misjudged and misunderstood by Britain as the desperation of the British attitude and action in the mid-east has been misunderstood by America.

The depression and disillusionment in this country over America's attitude can be illustrated by two remarks made to this correspondent in the last few days.

The first came from one of the most experienced foreign affairs specialists in the British government. He said:

"There are three courses in the mid-east. Either Britain policies the mid-east, or the United Nations is made effective enough to do it, or there will be chaos. And if the Americans want chaos, they can have it."

The other remarks came from a businessman in the midlands, who

CPYRIGHT

said: "Look, we have come to take this Anglo-American alliance as something we could count on—that you would always back us up in a pinch when our interests were vitally affected, because our interests and your interests are really in the end of the same."

"But now we find that we can't count on it any longer, so why should we go on pouring out millions for all this defense effort and this NATO stuff when we suddenly find we aren't even allowed to use it for ourselves?"

"What point is there in our giving you these air bases and supporting all of your policies if you aren't going to stand with us when it's a matter of our oil and our economy and our future? Why don't we just save all this money we're spending on defense and make the best of it with the Russians?"

Both statements show the deep emotional state to which reaction to American policy has sunk here.

Russia

By R. J. CUTLER

MOSCOW—The foreign policy of the United States is portrayed here in a variety of colors—all of them shades of black.

It is impossible to know what Kremlin leaders really think of American policy. If there speeches and the propaganda they direct are to be believed, it is compounded of equal parts of the "notorious" position of strength, aggressive intentions, subversion and hypocrisy.

Two recent shocks to the world—the blood revolution in Hungary and the fighting in Egypt—put in sharp focus the public Soviet attitude toward the foreign policy of its major rival on the world scene. As in the earlier East German riots and the uprising in Poznan, the Hungarian revolution was not permitted to be interpreted here as the violent expression of a people against communism.

Instead, the real villain turned out to be machinations of American policy as exemplified by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, who takes quite a propaganda beating here, and his younger brother, Allen W. Dulles, head of the Central Intelligence Agency, who

gets off no lighter.

EDITOR'S NOTE

How has American foreign policy on the Middle Eastern and Hungarian crises been received in the key capitals of the world?

New York Herald Tribune News Service correspondents in London, Paris, Moscow, in Cairo and Jerusalem, in Belgrade, Bonn as well as in Ottawa and Buenos Aires report on the effects Washington's action has had throughout the world.

The reports, in sum, show that individual nations tend to react to American foreign policy as the policy impinges on each country.

But the overriding consensus among the western allies is that the Atlantic Alliance must not be permitted to

The brothers Dulles and unnamed "ruling circles" of the United States, the Kremlin line held, had planned and organized subversion against the "people's" rule in Hungary to overthrow the government.

What is more, members of the United Nations who introduced resolutions full of "lies and slanders" about actions of Soviet troops and deportations to the Soviet Union were "lackeys" of United States policy, the Soviet press informed its followers.

However, the action of the United States in voting against its allies on the British and French landings in Egypt required a bit of stretching of the standard Soviet position, since American policy is described as "colonialist" here.

It did not take propagandists long to discover that the spectacle of the Soviet Union and the United States voting on the same side in the UN was not the honest conviction of America but "capitalist duplicity."

The United States, it was reported here, was not a "true friend of the Arabs" like Russia, but was trying to push out its capitalist allies in the middle of east and turn over their oil fields to it as "monopolies."

Perhaps the most hated facet of American policy here is the "aggressive" North Atlantic Treaty Organization. This "military bloc" is, according to the Soviet view, busily plotting war against Russia and its satellites.

Disarmament is another field in which American policy is suspect. The continual harping on inspection and control instead of evidencing trust in Soviet proposals is painted as unpeace-loving.

In total, the foreign policy of the United States is regarded here with about the enthusiasm shown in America for that of the Soviet Union.

France

By FRANK KELLEY

PARIS—French opinion generally shares the view of Foreign Minister Christian Pineau that France's only safeguards against a fate like that of Hungary's are friendship for the United States and continued membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

But it is not so sure that what France regards as the zigs and the zags of American foreign policy, particularly in recent United Nations votes, make the French membership in the UN so valuable any more.

There is resentment, but far less than in Britain, that while the United States was quick to join the Soviet bloc in condemning the Anglo-French venture against Egypt and then to join in demanding immediate withdrawal of the invading forces, it did not register much more than a moral protest in the UN against Russian reprisals in Hungary.

In recent weeks the French have tended to identify UN votes with policy, however unjustified that may be.